



DIALOGUE WITH AN EVOLUTIONIST

حِوَارٌ مَعَ صَاحِبِ مَذَهَبِ التَّطْوُرِ

DIALOGUE WITH AN EVOLUTIONIST¹

WWW.SALAFIMANHAJ.COM

¹ This is based upon actual discussions and interactions with evolutionists in our experience, so therefore this should not be merely viewed as a simplistic propaganda tract. We have come across those who have argued from the point of view of the evolutionist in this work and it is thus based upon actual experiences that we have encountered over the last ten years in *da'wah*. For example, the *Salafi* brothers who are active in *da'wah* in London will be aware of such specious arguments from those who adhere to the evolution theory via their interactions and conversations with them at Hyde Park Speaker's Corner and their inability to answer the questions that are asked of them. In some cases they have resorted to very irrational modes of behaviour after having been challenged, the complete antithesis of what they claim to be representing!? Therefore, this is more of a compilation of dialogues with pseudo-evolutionists who blindly follows the likes of Charles Darwin and Richard Dawkins.

MUSLIM²: As for Islaam, then we believe that humans we were created by Allaah for a noble and wise purpose. As the Qur'aan mentions, if you read it,

وَمَا خَلَقْتُ الْجِنَّ وَالْإِنْسَ إِلَّا لِيَعْبُدُونَ

“And I did not create the jinn or mankind except to worship Me”

{*ad-Dhaariyaat* (51): 56}

EVOLUTIONIST: But how do you explain the origin of species and that which is proved by scientific evidence?

MUSLIM: “Scientific evidence?” what do you intend by this?

EVOLUTIONIST: Well for example, empirical science and evidence which is used currently for understanding how the world works and based upon Darwin's theory of evolution.

MUSLIM: Understanding how something *works* is not the same as understanding *how* it came to be. So what can you tell me about this theory?

EVOLUTIONIST: Well, the theory is based upon on what was noted during excavations carried out during Darwin's time. What was discovered was that more ancient levels contained primitive life-forms and the levels above them contained progressively more developed life-forms. Darwin also explained the process of evolution as being via natural selection, destructive factors kill off the weaker specimens and leave the stronger specimens. This is what is also known as the survival of the fittest. Therefore, the strong specimens remain and pass on their strong characteristics to their offspring. These strong characteristics are combined as time goes by to form a new

² The Muslim here is intended to be a Muslim who follows the Qur'aan, *sunnah* and *manhaj* of the *salaf*, who has some idea of how to call to Allaah, with wisdom, good preaching and evidences. It is in no way meant to be modelled upon a Muslim who follows the likes of the literature of the '*Harun Yahya*' industry, which is an industry that fights against the *sunnah* and the *hadeeth*, and is based on the *manhaj* of the *Qur'aaniyoona*. Nor is it intended to be a Muslim who goes to excesses with regards to science and tries to prove every single scientific phenomena via the Qur'aan.

feature in the species. Nature selects that which is advantageous and unfavourable characteristics are discarded, this is what is meant by evolution, which makes the specimen develop into a superior specimen. This ongoing development is known as ‘evolution’ and it has been used by some scientists to explain human behaviour.

MUSLIM: This was thought of before Darwin as well by the way, by the Frenchman Lamarck. But this is a very flawed idea, I know about that theory which Lamarck outlined, as Lamarck was in fact the first to come with a theory of evolution, not Darwin. Did you know that?

EVOLUTIONIST: No, I didn’t.

MUSLIM: Darwin was the one who gave the theory more of a proper scientific direction and argue it systematically, but people were already thinking about it.

EVOLUTIONIST: Okay. In any case, every time a new characteristic emerges, it is passed on to the offspring. This is the scientific, rational, accurate and correct model as opposed to what you say which is irrational, religious, fanatical and incorrect.

MUSLIM: But how do we know which animals or plants are the “fittest”? what is the criterion?

EVOLUTIONIST: The fittest are those which survive the longest.

MUSLIM: But the theory does not show us the mechanism following which, higher organisms appeared on earth.

EVOLUTIONIST: Darwin noted that organisms give rise to many different varieties:

“Good varieties have an edge over the ‘not so good’ which are crowded out. Good variants then succeed in the struggle, they survive and over a long period of time, give rise to new organisms slowly and gradually.”

But it’s all about selection, nature choosing that which is more beneficial. Like the neck of a giraffe for example.

EVOLUTIONIST: But if there is a proto giraffe for example let's say, it begins by stretching its neck in order to eat the leaves on higher tree, as it stretches its neck, the offspring of the proto giraffe will increase until a giraffe is formed.

MUSLIM: This is indeed an outdated theory as know we have more knowledge about the reproductive system and molecular and biochemical processes. Therefore, a physiological change has absolutely no consequence on the offspring. Just because a man pumps himself up in a gym for thirty years it does not mean that his offspring are going to be born with great big rippling muscles and a six-pack does it?! If you chop your hand off or your nose gets blown off, your kids are not going to be born without a hand or nose are they? Because a physiological change has no influence, the change has to take place in your DNA and the information within you, which is already pre-determined, in your genes. This is why Lamarckism had to go out of the window. Furthermore, let us imagine that the earth's atmosphere has become so hot that we are living in a global desert wherein there is hardly any water or vegetation. So in this potential scenario would it not be excellent if human beings could develop a storage system like a camel!? 'Proto human camelus' or 'Homo sapiens camelus' it could be called, which had it special storage system in order to live in a super heated earth. How can such a future creature come into existence? For this to happen there has to be a change in the DNA, in the cells that are related to reproduction. So what has to happen is that the DNA has to change in order to produce a hump on your back. Natural selection according to you would have to select the advantages of having a hump on a human back due to the advantages that are associated with that. Now let's examine the problems with this.

EVOLUTIONIST: Okay I'm listening.

MUSLIM: the first problem is to do with this issue of mutation. How did this mutation take place in the first instance? How does DNA mutate?

EVOLUTIONIST: I'm not sure, I think that some scientists say that it just randomly mutates maybe due to radiation or ultra-violet light. Others say that it is due to copying errors and mistakes, which produce mutations. So I'm not really sure how it happens, but it happens.³ Out of all of these mistakes, this beneficial mutation takes place.

MUSLIM: Here we have a problem. Firstly, mutants have very weak reproductive capabilities and this is a fact. An example is with the tests that have been carried out on fruit flies in a laboratory. These fruit flies were bombarded with radiation, the results were that some flies had legs coming out of their heads instead of antennae, some flies with two heads, some with two bodies one head and then it is said “see how these mutations can take place!” But in fact what we find, as is the case with all mutants, they have weak reproductive capabilities, in other words they are not able to procreate or have offspring. This leaves a big problem for evolution, so how can a “future beneficial mutation” get to be passed on? If this mutant is able to procreate, the other problem and barrier in that is that who would like to have sex with a hunch-back homo-camelus? Unless you are some sort of freak! Every single species will look for the most perfect member of its species to procreate with, not a mutant hybrid specimen. So even if genes did happen to mutate to produce a beneficial mutation the odds against this being passed on are very low. Thirdly, there is no guarantee that this mutation would be passed on to the next generation. A person could have green eyes, yet his wife may have brown eyes, but their offspring could have blue eyes. How is this? Well the parents of one of the parents may have had blue eyes. So the genetic information may or may not be passed on or selected. On top of this we have to account for all of the different factors, like a ‘proto human camelus’ or ‘homosapiens camelus’ being rejected by its

³ This shows the lack of certainty that these people have in a theory that they have claimed is based on ‘evidence.’

parents if not aborted before it is even born with cries of “O, I have got a camel inside of me, let’s get rid of it!” leading to a child being aborted while the parents are not aware that the child was in fact the future of the human race? The ‘homosapeins camelus’ could die in infancy, be struck by lightening or run over by a car. All of these things could happen so what are the actual odds against any such “beneficial creature” actually existing? Virtually none. Yet we are supposed to believe that human beings, camels, giraffes, hippos, elephants, zebras, and all of the varied species on the earth are all a product of random mutation of DNA! The problems become insurmountable for evolution when we look at evolution at the biochemical level...

EVOLUTIONIST: Wait, but there is evidence for natural selection in nature.

MUSLIM: So what is the proof for this, surely there must be some sort of evidence, as you stated, for this? Are there any fossils within the fossil record which indicate the gradual appearance of new organisms in the fossil record? If so, can you refer me to the scientific journals or studies that have been conducted?

EVOLUTIONIST: Err, I’m not sure.⁴

MUSLIM: There are no fossils that indicate any transitional forms, from a species into another species. Studies of fossils records in fact prove that natural catastrophes were the cause of extinctions, which were sudden, collective and colossal, of such a magnitude that very few were spared from. The trilobites that were very successful and perfectly adapted to their habitat and dinosaurs that ruled the earth, water and air during the Mesozoic era

⁴ This again is the reality of the fallacy of many of those who blindly follow the theory of evolution. After spending much time in trying to promote themselves as being intellectual, rational, empirical and “supported by evidence” they are unaware of actual scientific research in the field!? As for those who claim to be aware of it, then they attempt to discreetly brush the issue under the carpet and try to bypass it.

were wiped out in a catastrophe. In fact those that were spared were the weaker, smaller and less fit reptile such as turtles, lizards and crocodiles!! Natural disasters such as volcanoes, floods, fires, earthquakes, typhoons, cyclones, rainstorms, hurricanes and tsunamis bring destruction to the whole population and only a few survive. Man-made bombs leave only burn out remains of once flourishing cities, as in the cases of Hiroshima and Nagasaki. Therefore, there are factors which are not under the control of species. Some plants produce chemicals which attract insects to feed on it and thus resulting in the plant's death. Natural selection does not intervene here to assist the tree. Secondly, if new species have evolved gradually, new organs also must have made their appearance gradually. Bones, feathers, horns, antlers and teeth are preservable structures. Why is it then, that the fossil record does not give any clue as to how these organs made their appearance. There is no sign of intermediate stages of development in their earliest fossils.⁵ The earliest fossils of bird show well developed feathers, indeed the Qur'aan says,

أَلْمْ يَرَوَا إِلَى الطَّيْرِ مُسَخَّرَاتٍ فِي جَوّ السَّمَاءِ مَا يُمْسِكُهُنَّ إِلَّا اللَّهُ
إِنَّ فِي ذَلِكَ لِلَّا يَعْلَمُ لِقَوْمٍ يُؤْمِنُونَ

⁵ Douglas Dewar, was an evolutionist who later rejected Darwinian evolutionary theory in his studies in bird life and zoology. He wrote many books against Darwinian evolution and wrote once: “According to the evolution theory all multicellular animals are derived from one-celled ancestors, which exhibit nothing that can be called an organ in the strict sense. Consider now the vast number of organs and structures which are supposed to have evolved in the descendants of these organ-less ancestors; every differentiated cell, bone, cartilage, muscle, tendon, nerve, blood-vessel, ganglion, hair, feather, scale, spine, shell, spur, antler, horn, hoof, claw, nail, tusk, antenna, appendage, every internal organ from the blood corpuscles to the stomach and liver. Every type of each of the above organs, according to the evolution theory, must have at one time existed in a nascent condition. Now consider the million or so existing species of animals, all of which are supposed to be in a state of flux, evolving. If these species be really evolving, the majority ought to exhibit nascent structures in all states of development, from unrecognisable excrescences to structures almost ready for use. Not a single one seems to exist.” (Douglas Dewar and H.S Shelton, *Is Evolution Proved?* (London: Hollis and Carter, 1947), pp.226-227.

“Do you not see the birds controlled in the atmosphere in the sky?
None holds them up except Allaah. Indeed in that are signs for a
people who believe.”

{*an-Nahl* (16): 79}

The same is true for horns, antlers and teeth, the earliest structures are completely formed and nor nascent. They have not evolved over a period of time, in fact some have had to propose a new theory of ‘punctuated equilibrium’ (evolution in large jumps) in order to account for this. The Cambrian explosion cannot be explained by this hypothesis, not to mention the appearance of new organs in succeeding classes, which were not found in reptiles. Lastly, what is the selective advantage of migration in face of tremendous odds in order to find their sustenance? A scientist, Von Bertalanffy wrote:

“...I for one, in spite all the benefits drawn from genetics and mathematical theory of selection, I am still at a loss to understand, why it is of selective advantage for the eels of Comacchio to travel perilously to the Sargasso Sea...”⁶

Many of these creatures have these abilities inherently in their formation, like a Chameleon for example. All creatures have limits beyond which they cannot pass, inborn potentials, not developed characteristics that have been formed due to the environment. Another clear sign of this is in Allaah’s creation in cattle and livestock, as Allaah says,

وَإِنَّ لَكُمْ فِي الْأَنْعَامِ لِعِبْرَةٍ تُسْقِيمُ مِمَّا فِي بُطُونِهَا وَلَكُمْ فِيهَا مَنَافِعٌ
كَثِيرَةٌ وَمِنْهَا تَأْكُلُونَ
وَعَلَيْهَا وَعَلَى الْفَلَكِ تُحْمَلُونَ

⁶ L. Von Bertalanffy, “Chance or Law” in A. Koestler and J.R. Smythies (eds.) *Beyond Reductionism* (London: Radius Books, Hutchinson, 1972), p.65.

“And indeed for you in livestock is a lesson. We give you drink from that which is in their bellies, and for you in them are numerous benefits, and from them you eat. And upon them and on ships you are carried.”

{*al-Mu'mineen* (23): 21-22}

Allaah also says,

أَوْلَمْ يَرَوْا أَنَا خَلَقْنَا لَهُمْ مِمَّا عَمِلْتُ أَيْدِينَا أَنْعَامًا فَهُمْ لَهَا مَالِكُونَ
وَذَلِّلَنَا هَا لَهُمْ فَمِنْهَا رَكْبُوْبُهُمْ وَمِنْهَا يَأْكُلُونَ
وَلَهُمْ فِيهَا مَنَافِعٌ وَمَسَارِبٌ أَفَلَا يَشْكُرُونَ

“Do they not see that We have created for them from what Our hands have made, grazing livestock, and (then) they are their owners? And We have tamed them for them, so some of them they ride and some of them they eat. And for them therein are (other) benefits and drinks, so will they not be grateful.”

{*Yaa Seen* (36): 71-73}

Allaah further says,

اللَّهُ الَّذِي جَعَلَ لَكُمُ الْأَنْعَامَ لِتَرْكَبُوا مِنْهَا وَمِنْهَا تَأْكُلُونَ
وَلَكُمْ فِيهَا مَنَافِعٌ وَلَتَبْلُغُوا عَلَيْهَا حَاجَةَ فِي صُدُورِكُمْ وَعَلَيْهَا وَعَلَى
الْفُلْكِ تُحْمَلُونَ

“It is Allaah who made for you the grazing animals upon which you ride, and some of them you eat. And for you in them are (other) benefits and that you may realise upon them a need which is in your chests; and upon them and upon ships you are carried.”

{*Ghaafir* (40): 79-80}

Contemplate upon these magnificent verses! Do we find ‘wild cattle’! Cattle have been created for the benefit of human beings and their very existence is for our benefit, usage and utilisation, will you not reflect!?

EVOLUTIONIST: But there was a bird that they found, a missing link, it had some reptilian features such as a long tail, beak lined with teeth, claws on the feathered fore-limbs and other traits.

MUSLIM: What was this?

EVOLUTIONIST: I have forgotten the name of it now.

MUSLIM: You mean the ‘Archaeopteryx’?

EVOLUTIONIST: I think that’s the one.

MUSLIM: So let’s look at it them, you are aware that this was later rejected as a proof for evolution?

EVOLUTIONIST: Was it?

MUSLIM: The fossil of this bird (Archaeopteryx) was found after Darwin’s first publication (*Origin of Species*) and many people were thus keen to find evidence for Darwin’s proposals. The fossils of the bird were found in the same rocks in those of the dinosaurs which became extinct. Therefore, it lead them to believe that Archaeopteryx had evolved from reptiles and represented an intermediate stage of evolution. Recent research has shown that some modern birds possess the so-called ‘reptilian features’ as seen in Archaeopteryx, such as the features you have mentioned. Ostriches, hoatzin in South America and Touraco in Africa are examples of this kind. As for a long tail being a reptilian feature, the pterodactyl had a short tail and this did not exclude them from being classified as ‘reptiles.’⁷ Furthermore, there are

⁷ Dewar noted: “**Archaeopteryx is a bird, as Dames and Deperet recognised. Its feathers indicate a warm blooded animal. Its compartment was that of a flightless bird...**” (Dewar, *op. cit.*, p.110). Brian Leith said, “Recently...” writing in 1982, “...there has been news of a true fossil bird that predates Archaeopteryx. In this way a single fossil may destroy an entire story that has been, falsely as it

still no fossils to this date that show how a reptile snout evolved into a beak! Or that show how brain size increased, how feathers evolved, how wing muscles developed and at what point warm-blooded birds emerged from cold-blooded reptiles. This was rejected in fact as being a transitional form.⁸

EVOLUTIONIST: Nature goes against unfavourable traits, this can be via chance mutation for example.

MUSLIM: The sting of a bee is fatal to a bee, yet bees have survived and so have their fatal trait, it was not weeded out via natural selection.

turns out, constructed to explain how one type evolves into another type. A general suspicion of evolutionary ‘stories’ is now felt by many cladists.” See: Brian Leith, *The Descent of Darwin* (London: Collins, 1982) p.102. Arthur Koestler stated: “**Equally chilling is the idea that some ancestral reptiles became transferred into birds by the small, step-by-step changes caused by random mutations affecting different organs. In fact one gets goose-pimples at the mere thought of the number of Monod’s roulette wheels which must be kept spinning to produce the simultaneous transformation of scales into feathers. Solid bones into hollow tubes, the outgrowth of air-sacs into various parts of the body, the development, and so forth. And this recasting of bodily structure is accompanied by basic changes in the internal systems, including excretion.** Birds never spent a penny! Instead of diluting their nitrogenous waste in water, which is a heavy ballast, they excrete it from the kidneys in a semi solid state through the cloaca. **Then there is also the little matter of the transition, by “blind chance”, from the cold-blooded to the warm blooded condition. There is no end to the specifications which have to be met to make our reptile air borne or to construct a camera eye out of living software.**” See; Arthur Koestler, *Janus – A Summing Up* (London: Hutchinson, 1978), p.175

⁸ Dr David Raup, a paleontologist at the *Field Museum of Natural History of Chicago* pointed out that “**Darwin was embarrassed by the fossil record because it did not look the way he predicted it would, different species usually appear and disappear from the record without showing the transitions that Darwin postulated, we are about 100 hundred years after Darwin and the knowledge of the fossil record has been greatly expanded. We now have a quarter of a million fossil species but the situation hasn’t changed much. We have fewer examples of evolutionary transition than we had in Darwin’s time. By this I mean that some of the classic cases of Darwinian change in the fossil record such as the evolution of the horse in North America, have had to be discarded or modified as a result of more detailed information.**” (In *Field Museum Natural History Bulletin* (no.50), pp.22-29) Dr David B. Kitts noted; “Evolution requires intermediate forms between species and paleontology does not provide them.” (*Evolution* (no.28), p.476).

EVOLUTIONIST: But the way it works is that members of a species are in competition with each other, and this species with another. For example, the animal which ran faster to escape its pursuer or which fought back more effectively or which excelled in some other relevant way, would be more likely to survive than its rivals and thus leave offspring carrying the genes which bestowed this advantage. Like wolves hunting deer for example, the fastest wolf kills the deer and eats the meat.

MUSLIM: This argument is flawed however, as wolves hunt in packs and then share the meat amongst themselves! Konrad Lorenz also showed that fish of different species will feed on the coral reef in close proximity but without any conflict.⁹ Some studies have demonstrated that there is co-operation and mutual aid among plants and animals and among different species of various animals, big and small. Mutualism, commensalisms and parasitism, are some of the ways organism depend upon each other. Stable communities remain stable because of interdependence of its members on each other. Within various groups of insects (bees, ants, wasps, etc.) there are organised societies where work is divided among its various individuals. Their mode of life, and their very existence is inextricably linked to their special kind of organisation. They have survived due to their interdependence. Among birds of the same flock, mammals (herds) and fish (schools) there is an aggregation of the similar kind for the maximum benefit of the whole society and strong to protect the weak and infirm as many mammal populations are known to do so. Chance mutations cannot produce integrated communities as we see in the animal kingdom and the balance we see in the eco-systems, which are planned and organised, diametrically opposed to chance. There are some other flaws, in terms of this selection of better capabilities proposal that you come with.

EVOLUTIONIST: Such as?

⁹ *On Aggression*

MUSLIM: Frogs are distinguished from man in their ability to live on the land and in water. Birds are distinguished from man by their ability to fly and move rapidly without the aid of a machine. A dog's nose is far more sensitive than that of a human, so is a dog's nose more advanced than a human's nose? Camels', horses' and donkeys' eyes see equally well by day and night, whereas human eyes are unable to see in the dark. An eagle's vision is far more acute than that of a human, so are eagles therefore more advanced than man?

EVOLUTIONIST: ok.

MUSLIM: Then there is the issue regarding colour-blind animals, most mammals cannot discriminate colours. Dogs are colour blind as are most other animals, therefore evolution theory does not account for why animals that are supposed to be quite low on the 'evolutionary scale', such as telecast fishes (trout, bass, perch, herring), frogs, turtles and lizards have colour vision. What happened on the way to animals? Evolution or degeneration?

EVOLUTIONIST: However, Darwin came along and clarified much more.

MUSLIM: Yet even during the time of Darwin, he did not know about genes and molecular biology. They did not actually know what was taking place in order to make various processes happen. So when we look at the actually level wherein these important changes need to happen, we find that evolution is but a legend and cannot account for it.

EVOLUTIONIST: Are you serious? Evolution does happen and is a fact!

MUSLIM: What I mean is evolution in the sense of a species changing into another, not micro-evolution which refers small variations within a species. Islaam has no problem with this, but the idea that a species evolved into another is the problem. When scientists speak of evolution being a proven fact, at best they can admit that this is in regards to micro-evolution, not macro-evolution. Many science books usually describe the process of micro-evolution, wherein nothing new had been created but rather the emphasis of

a trait that already exists. Therefore, this is supported by evidence, as for a species into another then such as an amoeba developing gradually and mutating to produce diverse life. This is untenable, statistically impossible and as we will see, when we look at the biochemical level we find that there is nothing to support the theory of evolution at all! Have you read Michael Denton's work?

EVOLUTIONST: No, but I have heard of him.¹⁰

MUSLIM: He is a molecular biologist who noted that:

"It is now well established that the pattern of diversity at molecular level conforms to a highly ordered heirarchic system. Each class at a molecular level is unique, isolated and unlinked by intermediates. Thus, molecules, like fossils, have failed to provide the illusive intermediates so long sought by evolutionary biology...there is little doubt that if this molecular evidence had been available one century ago it would have been seized upon with devastating effect by the opponents of evolutionary theory like Agassiz and Owen, and the idea of organic evolution might never have been accepted."¹¹ Therefore, on the biochemical level, evolution is proved to be a fallacy.

EVOLUTIONIST: In what sense though?

MUSLIM: After the 1950s when science had developed, molecular biology expanded, examining the basis of life and revealing molecular machines within our bodies, as the Qur'aan says,

وَفِي الْأَرْضِ آيَاتٌ لِلْمُوقِنِينَ

وَفِي أَنفُسِكُمْ أَفَلَا تُبْصِرُونَ

"And on the earth are signs for those certain (in faith) and in yourselves. Then will you not see?"

{*adb-Dhaariyaat* (51): 20-22}

¹⁰ Here, the one who claims to follow Darwinian evolution theory and is convinced that it is true is unaware of the evidence against it and the in-depth studies that fly in its face.

¹¹ Michael Denton, *Evolution – A Theory in Crisis* (London: Burnett, Books Ltd, 1985), pp.290-291.

After World War 2 electron microscopy developed, after being discovered by J.J Thomson. Now, cells did not look as merely simple as was thought in the 19th century. Complex structures were now being revealed. This threw much of Darwinian evolution into question, as Darwin viewed the cell as being a simple empty organism.¹²

EVOLUTIONIST: So you're proposing creationism?

MUSLIM: We reject this term, it should not be applied to Muslims. The term is used in the context of those who follow the Bible literally and believe that the earth is only six thousand years old, based upon the bible. Therefore, as Muslims do not base their evidence upon the Bible, you cannot apply the 'creationist' appellation to us. We believe in a Creator and that we were created, but as for this term 'creationism' and its current manifestation which is based upon evangelical Christians, we Muslims should not confused with them at all. There is no problem for us as Muslims to believe that the universe is billions of years old, as the physicists argue. Also due to some of the evangelical extremists that face the evolutionists in bible-belt America for example, this is what you seem to be very defensive of and try to apply to Islaam and Muslims.¹³

EVOLUTIONIST: But don't you Muslims also think that the universe was created in six days? This is the same as the creationists.

MUSLIM: have you actually read the Qur'aan?

¹² Here then, the very claim that evolutionists make about their theory being based upon science and evidence, is in fact false. As the evolutionary explanation for the origins of functions are not up to date with contemporary science and are in fact still rooted in Darwin's nineteenth century context.

¹³ This is the reality, as the Bible-belt Christians of America are so extreme that they follow the unauthentic and contorted Bible literally and in some cases are totally against any sort of progress! As a result, the hardcore Darwinian evolutionists also go to another extreme in order to challenge them and thus also make equally extreme comments, that are far from the 'rational' behaviour that they claim to be upholding. Muslims therefore, are not to be confused with this brand of 'creationism' which is nothing but an Anglo-American bible-belt evangelical Christian phenomenon. Both persuasions are equally excessive and do more to present science and religion as being incompatible with each other and as each being mutually exclusive.

EVOLUTIONIST: No, not properly.

MUSLIM: Therefore, you are not exactly in a good position to know as you have not even read the Qur'aan!

EVOLUTIONIST: Okay fair enough.

MUSLIM: The Qur'aan does mention this, however it is clearly known in the Qur'aan that 'a day' does not just mean 24 hours, a day just means 'a period of time' as Muslims also believe in the 'Day of Judgement', yet this is not 24 hours! Let's get back to the cell.

EVOLUTIONIST: okay

MUSLIM: therefore, biochemistry has pushed Darwin's theory to the limit, and the amazing complexity of subcellular organic structures begs the question, how could all of this evolved? Indeed, as the Qur'aan asks,

أَمْ حَلَفُوا مِنْ غَيْرِ شَيْءٍ أَمْ هُمُ الْخَالِقُونَ

“Or were they created by nothing, or were they the creators (or themselves)?”

{*at-Toor* (52): 35}

Let's take a glance at examples of biochemical system, in order for us to reflect.

EVOLUTIONIST: But before we do, according to Darwin, evolution can account for complex structures to have developed, if generations of organism slowly accumulate beneficial changes in a gradual process.

MUSLIM: Yet Darwin knew that if there was to be found within one generation an organ as complex as the eye suddenly appeared, this would pose a problem. Indeed, there is no evidence of the gradual development of the human eye, since its many sophisticated features are independent. Darwin therefore had to convince the people that complex organs could evolve in a step-by-step process. Darwin did not really try to discover a real pathway as to how evolution might have made the eye, all he did was point

at modern animals with different kinds of eyes (from the simple to the complex) and suggest that the evolution of the human eye might have evolved similar organs. To paraphrase of Darwin's argument: Although humans have complex camera-type eyes, many animals get by with less. Some tiny creatures have just a simple group of pigmented cells – not much more than a light sensitive spot. Yet such a simplistic arrangement does not account for vision, rather a sense of light and dark and meeting the creature's needs. Michael Behe notes:

“Using reasoning like this, Darwin convinced many of his readers that an evolutionary pathway leads from the simplest light-sensitive spot to the sophisticated camera-like eye of man. But the question of how vision began remained unanswered. Darwin persuaded much of the world that a modern eye evolved gradually from a simpler structure, but he did not even try to explain where his starting point – the relatively simple light sensitive spot-came from. On the contrary, Darwin dismissed the question of the eye’s ultimate origin: “How a nerve comes to be sensitive to light hardly concerns us more than how life itself originated.”¹⁴ He had an excellent reason for declining the question: it was completely beyond nineteenth century science. How the eye works – that is, what happens when a photon of light first hits the retina – simply could not be answered at that time. As a matter of fact, no question about the underlying mechanisms of life could be answered. How did animal muscles cause movement? How did photosynthesis work? How was energy extracted from food? How did the body fight infection? No one knew.”¹⁵ Therefore, the mistake of the scientists writing in the nineteenth century, who you claim to follow, was

¹⁴ Charles Darwin, *Origin of Species*, 6th ed. (New York: New York University Press, 1988), p.151

¹⁵ Michael Behe, *Darwin’s Black Box – The Biochemical Challenge to Evolution* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1996) p. 18. Within this acclaimed book, the author, a biochemical professor at *Lehigh University*, totally took apart Darwin's theory of evolution and demonstrated that it is too outdated to account for the complexity of life on a biochemical level. Behe also noted how even though some Evolutionists talk about 'evidence', that in fact there has been no scientific studies at all to demonstrate how such irreducibly complex systems within the human body could have come into existence via Darwin's outdated and backward theory of evolution. The conclusion of this book is that there must be a Designer and Creator behind it.

that because they could not see or assess biochemical and molecular organisms, they simply brushed them under the carpet as being “simple.” Time has demonstrated that his theory does not account for molecular structures. Darwin knew that his theory of gradual evolution by natural selection was shaky, noting: “If it could be demonstrated that any complex organ existed which could not possibly have been formed by numerous, successive, slight modifications, my theory would absolutely break down.”¹⁶

EVOLUTIONIST: Okay, but.....

MUSLIM: Even during the nineteenth century many scientists realised this flaw in Darwin’s theory of evolution. In 1871, Mivart noted:

“What is to be brought forward (against Darwinism) may be summed up as follows: That “natural selection” is incompetent to account for the incipient stages of useful structures. That it does not harmonizes with the co-existence of closely similar structures of diverse origin. That there are grounds for thinking that specific differences may be developed suddenly instead of gradually...that certain fossil transitional forms are absent, which might have been expected to be present...that there are many remarkable phenomena in organic forms upon which “Natural Selection” throws no light whatsoever.”¹⁷

EVOLUTIONIST: But Richard Dawkins¹⁸ says that Bombardier Beetle is not a proof of the ‘design’ that you promote.

¹⁶ Darwin, op. cit., p.154.

¹⁷ St. George Mivart, *On the Genesis of Species* (London: Macmillan and Co., 1871), p.21.

¹⁸ The evolution fanatic and blind-follower of his ‘Imaam’, Charles Darwin, Dawkins is the Chair in the *Public Understanding of Science* at *Oxford University* and the author of a number of books such as *The Blind Watchmaker*, *The Selfish Gene*, *The God Delusion* and other works. He is characterised by his whole hearted support of the theories of Charles Darwin, some of his main ideas will be refuted within this treatise. He is the most vehement in his blind following of Darwin and is convinced that evolution is supported by ‘clear evidence’ even though this treatise will actually display that the contrary is the case. He wrote in 1989 (April 9, p.34) in the *New York Times* that anyone who denies evolution is either “ignorant, stupid or insane (or wicked, but I’d rather not consider that.” This is the so-called ‘rationality’ and ‘tolerance’ which he and his groupies claim is the logical result for the belief in evolution!? Thereby indicating that he is a biased partisan to the school of thought of Darwin’s evolution theory and thus resorts to a number of crass and condescending modes of contention. As a result, even a number of atheists reject his arguments, with some even saying that Dawkin’s methods do more to encourage people to believe in the Creator! So even his own atheists throw his methodology

MUSLIM: Does he indeed?

EVOLUTIONIST: In refuting Francis Hitching, who tries the use the example of the beetle as a proof that it was created, Dawkins refuted him. Hitching in his book *Neck of the Giraffe* mentioned in trying to refute Darwin: “(The Bombardier beetle) squirts a lethal mixture of hydroquinone and hydrogen peroxide into the face of its enemy. These two chemicals, when mixed together, literally explode. So in order to store them inside its body, the bombardier beetle has evolved a chemical inhibitor to make them harmless. At the moment the beetle squirts the liquid out of its tail, an anti-inhibitor is added to make the mixture explosive once again. The chain of events that could have led to the evolution of such a complex, co-ordinated and subtle process is beyond biological explanation on a simple step-by-step basis. The slightest alteration in the chemical balance would result immediately in a race of exploded beetles.”¹⁹

This was Hitching’s stance, but Dawkins replied with:

“A biochemist colleague has kindly provided me with a bottle of hydrogen peroxide, and enough hydroquinone for 50 bombardier beetles. I am about to mix the two together. According to (Hitching), they will explode in my face. Here goes...well, I’m still here. I poured the hydrogen peroxide into the hydroquinone, and absolutely nothing happened. It didn’t even get warm....the statement that “these two chemicals, when mixed together,

and beliefs back in his face! Indeed, Michael Ruse, a Darwinian philosopher has stated: “Dawkins and Dennet are really dangerous, both at a moral and legal level.” (Madeline Bunting, ‘*Why the intelligent design lobby thanks God for Richard Dawkins*’ in *The London Guardian*, Monday March 27 2006 CE). Ruse also stated that due to Dawkins “Evolution is losing the battle” and that he “felt intensely irritated with Dawkins...” and all of this is from a fellow Darwinian! Furthermore, Dawkins has managed to build up a number of evolution groupies around himself, who also blindly follow him. Even though Dawkins in many cases utilises a sophisticated method of argumentation, he does not in reality deal with the main issues or answer the key fundamental questions at all. In fact he makes huge simplifications in order to bamboozle his readers into thinking that evolution can be explained easily, yet the reality is that on the biochemical level evolution cannot provide a sufficient explanation. The result of this is that other scientists to have to admit that the actual rational explanation is that there is a Creator and All-Wise Maker. In addition, Dawkins claim that evolution theory leads to atheism is untenable as there are many believe who adhere to evolution theory yet still believe in the Creator! Or those who believe that there is proof for micro-evolution on a small scale and thus allow some room for evolution.

¹⁹ Francis Hitching, *The Neck of a Giraffe* (London: Pan, 1985), p.68

literally explode,” is, quite simply, false, although it is regularly repeated throughout the creationist literature. If you are curious about the bombardier beetle, by the way, what actually happens is as follows. It is true that it squirts a scaldingly hot mixture of hydrogen peroxide and hydroquinone at enemies. But hydrogen peroxide and hydroquinone don’t react violent together unless a catalyst is added. This is what the bombardier beetle does. As for the evolutionary precursors to the system, both hydrogen peroxide and various kinds of quinines are used or other purposes in body chemistry. The bombardier beetle’s ancestors simply pressed into different service chemicals that already happened to be around. That’s how evolution works.”²⁰ So this is an example of evolution!

MUSLIM: Okay, but let’s analyse this carefully, there’s no need to get excited. Even though Dawkins gets the better of Hitchings with this example, Dawkins explanation for the evolution of the system rests on the fact that the system’s elements just “happened to be around.” But Dawkins has not explained at all just how hydrogen peroxide and quinines came to be secreted together at very high concentration into one compartment that is connected through a tube to a second compartment that contains enzymes necessary for the rapid reaction of the chemicals!²¹ So the key question still remains, which is *how* could complex biochemical systems be gradually produced? The other problem with Dawkins and Hitchings debate is that they both argue past each other, one gets the facts wrong and the other just corrects them, the question still was not answered as to what are the stages of beetle evolution and how does Darwin evolution explain it? Dawkins did not give us a shred of evidence of *how* it could have happened.

EVOLUTIONIST: But are there any types of biological systems that you can show that could not have been formed by “numerous, successive, slight modifications” as Darwin argued?²²

²⁰ Richard Dawkins, *The Blind Watchmaker* (London: W.W Norton, 1985), pp.86-87.

²¹ Behe, op.cit. p.34.

²² All of this *kalaam* is pure conjecture and theory, the evolution theory is steeped in assumptions and *conceptual* precursors but not *actual physical* precursors. Michael Behe notes: “**To clarify the point,**

MUSLIM: So let's get back to this, if we look at a biological system that is irreducible complex, a single system composed of several well-matched, interacting parts that contribute to the basic function, wherein the removal of any one of the parts causes the system to effectively cease functioning. Such an irreducibly complex system could not have been produced by improving upon the initial function, which continues to work by the same mechanism, by slight, successive modifications of a precursor system, because any precursor to an irreducibly complex system that is missing a part is by definition non-functional. This is a huge challenge to Darwinian evolution, since natural selection can only choose systems that are already working, then if a biological system cannot be produced gradually it would have to arise as an integrated unit, at once, for natural selection to have any act upon it.

EVOLUTIONIST: Well there may be a possibility that there was multiple simultaneous mutation, even though the odds may be very small, even lucky.²³

consider this sequence: skateboard, toy wagon, bicycle, motorcycle, automobile, airplane, jet plane, space shuttle. It seems like a natural progression, both because it is a list of objects that all can be used for transportation and also because they are lined up in an order of complexity. They can be conceptually connected and blended together into a single continuum. But is, say, a bicycle a physical (and potentially Darwinian) precursor of a motorcycle? No. It is only a conceptual precursor. No motorcycle in history, not even the first, was made simply by modifying a bicycle in a stepwise fashion. It might easily be the case that a teenager on a Saturday afternoon could take an old bicycle, an old lawnmower engine, and some spare parts and (with a couple of hours of effort) build himself a functioning motorcycle. But this only shows that humans can design irreducibly complex systems, which we already knew already. To be a precursor in a Darwin's sense we must show that a motorcycle can be built from "numerous, successive, slight modifications to a bicycle." (Behe, op.cit., pp.43-44)

²³ This is in fact the empty reasoning that an evolutionist will resort to in the end. For example, one *Cambridge University* student mentioned once that "even though it is highly unlikely that this universe could have emerged randomly, there is still a slight possibility, and anyway it is still better for me to believe in it as we do not know otherwise." Here says "we" as if including the Muslims, the believers, within his band of those ignorant of their Lord and arrogant towards Him. This argument is like asking a student not to attend any of his lectures, yet to still sit the exam at the end, as there is a "slight possibility" that he will pass the exam!

MUSLIM: But this is an empty argument that you are bringing now, as now you are basing it upon metaphysical speculation not on scientific explanation! Indeed, the Qur'aan notes:

إِنَّ يَتَّبِعُونَ إِلَّا الظَّنَّ وَمَا تَهْوَى الْأَنْفُسُ وَلَقَدْ جَاءَهُمْ مِّنْ رَّبِّهِمُ الْهُدَىٰ

“They follow not except assumption and what their souls desire, and there has already come to them guidance from their Lord.”

{*an-Najm* (53): 23}

So let us attempt to evolve a bicycle into a motorbike by the ‘gradual accumulation of mutations’. Imagine there is a factory producing bicycles, but occasionally there was a mistake in manufacture, which led to an improvement on the bicycle and this in turn led to increased demand of such a bicycle to the extent that the factory had to make the mutation a permanent feature.

EVOLUTIONIST: So like biological mutations, successful mechanical mutations would reproduce and spread.

MUSLIM: However, each change can only be a slight modification, duplication or rearrangement of a pre-existing component and the change must improve the function of the bicycle. So if the factory by mistake increased the size of a screw or decreased the size of the handlebars or put the pedals on the crossbar or added a quick release frame or left off the front wheel, if any of these slight changes improved the bike ride, then the improvement would immediately be noticed by the consumers and the mutated bikes would be dominant in a Darwinian sense.

EVOLUTIONIST: Sure.

MUSLIM: With this in mind then, can we really evolve a bicycle into a motorbike?

EVOLUTIONIST: We can move in the right direction by making the seat more comfortable in small steps, the wheels can be made bigger and adapting the shape, through slight successive modifications.

MUSLIM: But a motorbike depends on a source of fuel, and a bicycle has nothing whatsoever that could be adapted or modified to become a gas or petrol tank! So what part of the bicycle would be duplicated to begin building a motor? Even if some kind of engine was brought into the bicycle factory, the motor would have to be fitted and connected correctly, how could this be done step-by-step from bicycle parts? A factory that made bicycles simply could not produce a motorbike by Darwin's theory of natural selection acting on variation by "numerous, successive, slight modifications" and in fact there is no example in history of a complex change in a product occurring in this manner.

EVOLUTIONIST: Good point, so there must be physical precursors not just conceptual ones.

MUSLIM: So now let's look at irreducible complex systems within our bodies, which need all inter-related components for it to work, like a mousetrap, every single part needs to be there in order for it to work. The mousetrap contains a piece of wood (the platform), a spring and the trap, a latch to hold the spring and a catch to tip of the latch so that the trap can go.

EVOLUTIONIST: Okay.

MUSLIM: If we take away any single bit then it does not work and function, it all has to be put together in the right place at the right time. The spring has to be of the right strength and tension and the platform has to be of a certain solid form. This is a simple example of an irreducibly complex system wherein every part has to be there exactly. The problem for evolution is that when we begin to examine the human being or an animals and primitive cell on the molecular level we find many irreducible complex

systems. For example, blood-clotting which we do not think much of but when we actually how the molecules and chemicals work to make your blood clot, we have another irreducible complex system. Cells have something called a bacterial flagellum²⁴ which has a little propeller that cause the cell to move, when we look at what it is composed of and what it needs in order for it to move it is more complex than a mousetrap. So how did these things come into existence? What is the actual process through which they evolved?

EVOLUTIONIST: There is surely an evolutionary explanation.

MUSLIM: Can you refer me to any of the scientific journals and literature that have attempted to account for it via Darwin's theory of evolution?

EVOLUTIONIST: Err, no.

MUSLIM: In fact, as the biochemists know, there has not been any research about this important medical and biological system emerging via evolution! The literature and so-called 'evolutionary evidence' is totally non-existent! So even though we are told that we must view everything through evolution,²⁵ no scientists have ever published a model to explain the gradual evolution of a vital molecular machine of life.²⁶

²⁴ Some bacteria have this amazing swimming device, the flagellum, which has no counterpart in more complex cells. In 1973 it was discovered that some cells swim by rotating their flagella. So the bacterial flagellum acts as a rotary propeller, in contrast to the cilium, which acts more like an oar. The rotary nature of the bacterial flagellar motor was a startling, unexpected discovery. Unlike other systems that generate mechanical motion (muscles, for example) the bacterial motor does not directly use energy that is stored in a "carrier" molecule such as ATP. Rather, to move the flagellum it uses energy generated by a flow of acid through the bacterial membrane. The requirements for such a principle are quite complex and are the focus of active research. (See Behe, *op.cit.* pp.70-73)

²⁵ Many students learn from their textbooks that the world should be viewed through an evolutionary lens, however they do not learn how Darwinian evolution might have produced any of the complex intricate biological systems that are in us!?

²⁶ Herein, the blind follower of Darwin will be totally bamboozled. After arrogantly trying to assert that his evolution *baatil* has 'evidence' and fully laden proofs, he will know begin to be at a loss.

وَفِي الْأَرْضِ آيَاتٌ لِّلْمُوقِنِينَ

وَفِي أَنفُسِكُمْ أَفَلَا تُبْصِرُونَ

“And on the earth are signs for those certain (in faith) and in yourselves. Then will you not see?”

{*ad-Dhaariyaat* (51): 20-22}

No one from the universities of Oxford, Cambridge, Harvard, the National Institutes of Health, the National Academy of Sciences, no Nobel prize winner has presented a detailed account of how the complex biological systems within us could have arise via Darwinian evolution! Our bodies are already extremely complex yet at the biochemical level there is even more unimaginable complexity with irreducible complexity.

EVOLUTIONIST: But there are examples that indicate that the creation as you call it, and within nature there are things that are not perfect in form.²⁷

MUSLIM: Even though it may be the case that there appear to be some things which are not ‘perfect’ as you describe them then this does not detract from the ability of the Creator in doing so. Even within the manufacture of cars it is known that sometimes manufacturers intentionally build with obsolescence intentionally so that it will not last long as it might, for reasons which supersede the simple goal of ‘perfect design and creation.’ Another point is that it is personal decision in order to test and try, as in the case of a parent who does not give his children the best things in order not

²⁷ As a result of not being able to refute the previous argument, the blind follower of Darwin will then move onto another line of argumentation to try and cover her/his tracks. The only thing that the atheist or the hardcore evolutionist will thus say in response to the evidence that has just been mentioned in refutation of evolution theory is that the creation just came about into existence, miraculously. This is not logical, rational or scientific because if we are to be scientific an explanation is needed, the most logical being there is a Creator and Maker.

to spoil them. So what you are saying overlooks the fact that the Creator may have various motives. As the Qur'aan says...

وَرَبُّكَ يَخْلُقُ مَا يَشَاءُ وَيَخْتَارُ مَا كَانَ لِهِ الْخِيَرَةُ سُبْحَانَ اللَّهِ وَتَعَالَى
عَمَّا يُشْرِكُونَ

“And your Lord creates what He wills and chooses; the choice was not for them. Exalted is Allaah and high above what they associate with Him.”

{*al-Qasas* (28): 68}

Also for you to even attempt to make some sort of psychoanalysis upon the Creator of the heavens and the earth is futile and impossible, as unless the Creator has *told* you what His reasons are. For Muslims we hold that the Creator has told mankind as to the reasons, which I mentioned at the very beginning. So for you to attempt to make a psychoanalysis of the Creator, whilst not having even bothered to search for where He may have revealed His wisdom, and to then reason that due to perceived ‘flaws’ there evolution must have taken place, is false and emotional, not based upon scientific proof and evidence which you claimed to adhere to. Also it may be the case that various organs that you regard as being of no value and ‘imperfect’ may indeed have some function of which you are currently ignorant of. Furthermore, you still have not accounted for how the functions could have arisen in the first instance! Finally, your argument here is like saying just because a photocopier makes a dozen good copies and one bad copy, it would be wrong for me to use the smeared copy as evidence that the photocopier came about via evolution and selection!

EVOLUTIONIST: Yeah, but who then created the Creator.²⁸

²⁸ After having been forced back into his position and not be able to bring any evidence for his argument, Shaytaan will come to this individual, as the Prophet Muhammad (*sallallaahu alayhi wasallam*) informed of, and whisper to him “Who created Allaah?”

MUSLIM: This is a common doubt that is put forward and is actually out of place and should not really be asked. Because you have thought of this question by trying to make an analogy between the creation which has its own separate rules and principles according to which it is governed and maintained and between the Creator and Originator of the heavens and the earth into existence.

وَالسَّمَاءَ رَفَعَهَا وَوَضَعَ الْمِيزَانَ

“And the heaven He raised and imposed the balance...”

{*ar-Rahmaan* (55): 7}

The two are entirely different. So within the creation of the universe everything has a cause as that is the way Allaah has created it and He is the Originator of those causes. We cannot work further back without affirming the existence of the Creator and Originator, one who is the first, without beginning nor end, who is not created but is Himself the Creator.²⁹

EVOLUTIONIST: So why did the theory become so popular if it is so flawed? Why was it so widely accepted by the intelligentsia then and now?

MUSLIM: The reasons are more than just scientific and we need to understand the conditions of nineteenth century Europe.

1. The initial problems with Darwin’s theory were merely brushed under the carpet in comparison to the church’s dogmatic attitude to science, which was one of ignorance, and backwardness.
2. The church was/is adamant that the earth was no more than six thousand years old, whereas the fossils proved that the earthy was much older than that.

²⁹ See Salafi Publications, *Two Ways to Know the Creator – From the Words of Ibn Qayyim* (TZK090003@safafipublications.com)

3. The established church proclaimed that species did not undergo any change where as production of varieties among the living organisms was a well known fact.
4. In that suffocating environment, Darwin's theory must have felt like a new breath of fresh air in comparison of the church's static view of the world with no progress. People took on atheism therefore because of the church's stubborn stand against science. Bishop Samuel Wilberforce was defeated by Thomas Huxley
5. The Church's attitude toward science, evidence and rational proofs were notoriously well known to scientists, some of whom were persecuted in a number of ways, poisoned, burned at the stakes or killed in cold-blood, all under the banner of Christianity. Darwin appeared to be like knight in shining armour who dared to challenge the status quo. As a result, although some in-depth research has led to many discoveries in recent times which has uncovered basic flaws in Darwin's theory of evolution, prejudice against the Western church and forms of Western evangelism and literalism clouds the minds of the neo-evolutionists.³⁰ Evolution itself would later be used as an act of vengeance, replacing one orthodoxy with another, and was thus used as a means to destroying other nations under colonialism in order to dominate and rule such people who were regarded as being 'lower, in their evolutionary development.' Colonialists education, after attempting to destroy the religion of conquered peoples, imposed the study of evolution theory under the garb of being 'science' and based upon 'evidence.' But in Europe, after they had dealt the final blow to their deviated religion, they announced that Darwin's theory, which they had used in the battle to support science against religion, was not a scientific fact; it was no more than a

³⁰ Khurshid S. Nadvi, *Darwinism on Trial* (London: Ta-Ha Publishers, 1414 AH/1993 CE), p.93.

theory, and the more science advanced, the more the falsehood of this theory became apparent.³¹ In Germany, Adolf Hitler developed upon evolution theory, with his bizarre Nazi concept of the superior race placing the Germans at the very top! In 1906 CE here was an exhibition of man's so-called "evolutionary ancestors" monkeys, chimps, a gorilla, and orang-utan and an African man named Ota benga from a tribe of Bushmen. He was brought from the Belgian Congo which at the time was under the iron-fist of the Belgian colonialists, by Samuel Verner, along with other pygmies. They were all displayed in the 1904 St. Louis world's fair. Ota Benga was born in 1881 had a height of 4ft. 11 in and weighed 103 lbs. after the St. Louis exhibition, Ota found himself at the Bronx Zoo which at that time was under the direction of Dr William T. Hornaday. Hornaday believed that there was "no difference between a wild beast and the little black man." Under the threat of legal action, Hornday had to release Benga from his cage and let him walk about the zoo, but at night he would sleep in the monkey house. 40,000 visitors would visit the zoo's monkey house in order to see what they had been informed of was the evolutionary missing link between ape and man, the wild black man from Afirca. Benga was thus chased about, poked at, prodded, tripped up, laughed at, jeered at and yelled at. After leaving the zoo, several institutions tried to help him yet he quit college to work in a tobacco factory. He later killed himself in 1916 by shooting himself through the heart.³² Other evolutionist textbooks also equate those of African origin with the ape! This was all the more true during the period Darwin's ideas came to fruition.

³¹ 'Umar S. al-Ashqar, *Belief in Allaah, Islamic Creed Series – Vol.1* (Riyadh: International Islamic Publishing House, 2003) pp.142-143.

³² Philip V. Bradford and Harvey Blume, *Ota Benga – The Pygmy in the Zoo* (New York: St Martins, 1992).

6. Furthermore, why evolution theorists are so reluctant to admit the signs that indicate a Creator and Maker is due to their own philosophical considerations. They just don't want to believe in anything outside of 'nature' that affects nature. In this way the evolutionists are just as biased partisans as bible-bashers from the southern American Bible-belt states who believe that the earth is only six thousand years old, coming with a prejudice that restricts them and leads to irrational behaviour from both partisan camps.

EVOLUTIONIST: Darwin's ideas were highly original and unique for his time in any case, for that he should be commended.

MUSLIM: Are you sure that this is the case? Many of Darwin's contemporaries accused him of plagiarism. Francis Hitching mentions this, "It is one of the less pleasing sides of Darwin's otherwise affable and scholarly nature that he could never bring himself to acknowledge a debt to the many predecessors in his field who were puzzling about the origin of species."³³

Darwin also benefited from the works on animals and plant evolution done by Muslim scientists. Did you know that Darwin studied Arabic?

EVOLUTIONIST: Really? I didn't know that.

MUSLIM: This is something that it is not well known and seems to be covered up to a large extent. He studied Arabic while he was studying Theology at *Cambridge University*. He remained in correspondence with his Arabic teacher Samuel Lee (1783-1852 CE) for a long time after leaving the university. As a result, it is likely that Darwin studied the textbooks that were used for studying Arabic in European universities.

EVOLUTIONIST: But didn't the Muslim world have a similar history of fighting against science?

MUSLIM: What's your evidence?

³³ Hitching, *op.cit.* p.227.

EVOLUTIONIST: Well I can't think of anything specific example off my head right now, yet the Muslims have also had a similar approach to science.

MUSLIM: You haven't given an example of this taking place though. In fact in the Muslim world there was no such aggression against science. The best example is when the Muslims ruled Spain for hundreds of years, the educational curricula of the Muslims (in the ten century CE) included subjects such as mathematics, botany, zoology, geology, medicine and further subjects, after having studied the Qur'aan. Therefore, there was no contradiction in studying such subjects and this was a thousand years ago! Comparatively, Europe was still slumped in the Dark Ages. Pimienta-Bey notes:

"One can easily recognise the historical foundation and prototype for Europe's concept of the "Renaissance Man," in the societal reality and educational philosophy of the medieval Moors."³⁴

One of the famous Christian European kings, Alfonso X ("the wise") supported a school of translators at Toledo during the 13 century CE, in order to translate works from Arabic. Toldeo thus became the major centre of translation for Christian Europe and as a result Toledo became more productive than other centres of translation in Europe such as those in Barcelona, Tarazona, Leon, Segovia, Pamplona, Toulouse, Beziers, Narbonne and Marseilles.³⁵ Alfonso X promoted Muslim learning and erudition and his actions had great impact upon Spain and ultimately Western Europe. It has thus been suggested that the Spanish universities at Palencia (founded in 1214 CE by Alfonso the eighth), Salamanca (founded in 1215 CE) and Lerida (founded in 1300 CE by Jaime the second in

³⁴ Jose V. Pimienta-Bey, "Moorish Spain – Academic Source and Foundation for the Rise and Success of Western European Universities in the Middle Ages" in Ivan Van Sertima (ed.), *Golden Age of the Moor* (New Brunswick and London: Transaction Publishers, 1992), pp.168-247.

³⁵ Charles Homer Haskins, *Studies in the History of Medieval Science* (New York: Frederick Ungar Publishers, 1960), p.17.

Aragon)³⁶ were all primarily established for the specific purpose of translating the Arabic treatises of the Muslims into Latin.³⁷ He notes:

“The first university in Christian Spain was founded at Palencia by Alfonso the eighth in the thirteenth century and the teachers employed were Muslims and Jews.”³⁸

In fact, when we look the period in which most of Europe’s oldest and finest universities were established, one cannot but be struck by the proximity in time to the scientific flowering of Muslim Andalus and the establishment of European centres for the translation of Moorish documents.³⁹

EVOLUTIONIST: Such as? What universities?⁴⁰

MUSLIM: Well, according to the research that has been conducted the universities of Bologna (est. 1158), Montpellier (est. 1180), Oxford (est. 1200 CE), Valencia (est. 1209 CE), Toulouse (est. 1223 CE), Naples (est. 1224 CE), Padua (est. 1228 CE), Rome (est. 1245 CE), Salamanca (est. 1250 CE), Cambridge (est. 1257 CE), Coimbra (est. 1279 CE) and Lisbon (est. 1290 CE). Pimiment-Bey thus notes due to these facts:

“The revelations of the above clearly support the contention that Europe’s academic ascension was primarily born of its contacts with the Moors who were occupying European soil. The establishment of these famed European universities during the same time its scholars are studying the works of Moorish Andalus, even making them standard texts in astronomy, mathematics, medicine etc., cannot simply be dismissed as

³⁶ James Monroe, *Islam and the Arabs in Spanish Scholarship* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1970) p.205.

³⁷ After the Spanish conquistadores ejected the Muslims from Spain in 1492 CE, Cardinal Jimenez de Cisneros ordered the burning of nearly eighty-thousand books in the public square of Granada. The Cardinal is said to have asserted that “since the books were all in Arabic, they were Qur'aans, and therefore dangerous.” (Monroe, *op cit.* p.13)

³⁸ S.S. Imamuddin, *Some Aspects of the Socio-Economic and Cultural History of Muslim Spain* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1965) p.137-138.

³⁹ Anwar Chejne, *Muslim Spain – Its History and Culture* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1974), p.350.

⁴⁰ Another example of the ignorance of on who claims to be “well grounded in evidence”, you will find that the one who claims to be ‘rational’ and ‘intellectual’ will not even know the intellectual and scholastic history of his own people!

coincidence. The extent of the Moorish impact upon all areas of western academia can be demonstrated.”⁴¹

Many of the stars and constellations are named from Arabic words such as Acrab, Altair, Pherkhard, Denab, Nadir, Azimuth are all of Arabic origin. Other English words of Arabic origin are Alcohol, Cipher etc.

For centuries, the mastery of medical works which were compiled by Muslim scholars were required for obtaining medical degrees at Europe’s most prestigious universities. In 1311 CE, the Catholic Church even held a council in Vienne, where they pronounced and endorsed the study of Arabic at the universities in Rome, Paris, Bologna, Oxford and Salamanca.⁴² One Spanish professor noted, even as late as the sixteenth century CE that, “there is a great need for Arabic, especially among doctors of medicine...Nunez is learned...it should be awarded to him, were it not for the sake of his Arabic.”⁴³

In summary, the medieval non-Muslim European had several means of acquiring the wisdom of the Muslims that were in Spain, by either direct study at an Islamic university, like the ones in Qurtuba (Cordova) or Granada; purchasing of books as there were 20,000 booksellers in Qurtuba; instruction from Muslim teachers at European schools inside or outside of the Iberian peninsula; via the standardised use of texts that had been translated from Arabic at European institutions. Indeed, all of these modes of knowledge acquisition were employed by curious medieval Europeans who recognised the superiority of the Muslims during that era.⁴⁴

⁴¹ Pimiento-Bey, *op cit.* p.225.

⁴² James Monroe, *op cit.* p.41.

⁴³ *Ibid.* p.4.

⁴⁴ Andalusian cities even had streets “paved, lighted and finely drained by the middle of the tenth century” writes McCabe who compared these images of Muslim Spain with London and Paris six centuries later. [Joseph McCabe, *The Moorish Civilisation in Spain* (Girard Kan.: Haldemar-Julius Co., 1927), p.20] McCabe said of sixteenth century Paris and London, “Foul and contaminated water trickled along, or lay in stagnant pools, on the unpaved streets....” Hospitals were established in most Andalusian cities which were equipped with baths and running water. These hospitals were open for Muslims and non-Muslims, open twenty four hours a day, regardless of the patients’ ability to pay. Drugs and food were always available and the Muslim physicians were knowledgeable in such things

EVOLUTIONIST: But religion's irrational roots breed intolerance to the point of murder. This is as opposed to science which breeds rationality, empirical investigation, neutrality and non-biased enquiry.

MUSLIM: This may have been the case with religion and may be present today, but been modern secular campaigns of terror and extermination even make Islamic terrorist operations seem minuscule in comparison!⁴⁵ Just look at the Nazi's reign of terror and the communist atheist despotism of Stalin, Pinochet and Mao. The dropping of the atomic bombs upon Hiroshima and Nagasaki have been justified on a secular basis not upon religion. The major wars of the last one hundred have had nothing to do with religion in fact, more to do with secular power and politics! Hitler's methods owe more to evolution theory than to Christianity. Michael Burleigh in his book *The Third Reich – A New History* notes about Hitler: **“In reality his views were a mixture of materialist biology...and a visceral anti-clericalism.”** Burleigh goes on to quote from Hitler's *Table Talk* in which the Fuhrer tells his dinner guests: **“The war will be over one day. I shall then consider**

as blood circulation, measles, and small-pox. (Chejne, *op cit.* p.352) Muslim society in Spain enjoyed recreations such as horse racing, marksmanship, polo etc. there were also literary salons attended by the learned. There were also public baths (*hammaamaat*) with separate facilities for men and women, this remains in Muslim countries such as Morocco. In contrast with the Muslim regard for hygiene and cleanliness, was the contempt for it in western Europe at the time of th Muslim rule of Spain, in fact the public baths were totally destroyed by the conquistadores, indicating their ignorant mentality. The English historian, Charles H. Haskins, also highlighted the contempt which the vast majority of Europeans had for bathing. (Haskins, *op cit.* p.257) also see Terence McLaughlin's historical study *Dirt – A Social History as Seen Through the Uses and Abuses of Dirt*.

⁴⁵ Dominic Lawson writing in *The Independent* (of London) noted: **“...the modern era has dwarfed those crimes with the countless millions slaughtered or starved at the hands of purely secular powers: not just the Nazis but also by the Cardinals of Communism, Josef Stalin and Mao Zedong. What these campaigns of extermination demonstrate – campaigns compared to which the annihilation of the World Trade Centre by the Islamic fundamentalist Bin Laden was a mere bagatelle...”** (Dominic Lawson, “*An unbeliever's defence of religious faith*” in the London *Independent*, Tuesday, 17 January 2006, p.29)

that my life's final task will be to solve the religious problem...The organised lie must be smashed..."

EVOLUTIONIST: But do you not think that science promotes non-bias and hard solid facts?

MUSLIM: This is not necessary the case and the theory of evolution that you promote so much has done much in the way of promoting inequalities and oppression.

EVOLUTIONIST: How?

MUSLIM: The ‘selective’ breeding of human beings was first formulated in the modern period by Francis Galton in 1865 CE, who ironically was none other than the cousin of Charles Darwin! During the 1860s and 1870s Francis Galton systematized these ideas and practices according to new knowledge about the evolution of man and animals provided by the theory of his cousin, Charles Darwin. After reading Darwin’s *Origin of Species*, Galton noticed an interpretation of Darwin’s work whereby the mechanisms of natural selection were potentially thwarted by human civilization. He reasoned that, since many human societies sought to protect the underprivileged and weak, those societies were at odds with the natural selection responsible for extinction of the weakest.

Nazi Germany under Adolf Hitler was infamous for eugenics programs which attempted to maintain a “pure” German race through a series of programs which ran under the banner of “racial hygiene.” Among other activities, the Nazis performed extensive experimentation on live human beings to test their genetic theories, ranging from simple measurement of physical characteristics to the more horrific experiments carried out in the concentration camps. During the 1930s and 1940s the Nazi regime forcibly sterilized hundreds of thousands of people whom they viewed as mentally and physically “unfit” and killed tens of thousands of the institutionalized

disabled through compulsory euthanasia programs. They also implemented a number of “positive” eugenics policies, giving awards to “Aryan” women who had large numbers of children and encouraged a service in which “racially pure” single women were impregnated by SS officers! Many of their concerns for eugenics and racial hygiene were also explicitly present in their systematic killing of millions of “undesirable” Europeans including Jews, gypsies and the disabled during the Holocaust.⁴⁶

In America, some states sterilized “imbeciles” for much of the 20th century. The *US Supreme Court* ruled in the 1927 *Buck v. Bell* case that the state of Virginia could sterilize those they thought unfit. The most significant era of eugenic sterilization was between 1907 and 1963 when over 64,000 individuals were forcibly sterilized under eugenic legislation in the United States.⁴⁷ A favorable report on the results of the sterilizations in California, by far the most sterilizing state, was published in book form by the biologist Paul Popenoe and was widely cited by the Nazi government as evidence that wide-reaching sterilization programs were feasible and humane!! When Nazi administrators went on trial for war crimes in Nuremberg after World War 2, they justified the mass-sterilizations (over 450,000 in less than a decade) by citing the United States as their inspiration.⁴⁸

⁴⁶ Robert Proctor, *Racial Hygiene: Medicine under the Nazis* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1988).

⁴⁷ Some 60,000 Americans were forcibly sterilized in eugenic campaigns organized by American corporate philanthropic organizations such as the *Carnegie Institution* and the *Rockefeller Foundation*. The program was then transplanted to Germany where the *Rockefeller Foundation* and American eugenacists founded and funded Nazi eugenics. See: Edwin Black, *War Against the Weak: Eugenics and America's Campaign to Create a Master Race* (Four Walls Eight Windows, 2003).

⁴⁸ For more on the connections between the U.S. and Nazi eugenics and eugenacists see Stefan Kühl, *The Nazi Connection: Eugenics, American Racism, and German National Socialism* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1994).

Despite the changed post-war attitude towards eugenics in the US and some European countries, a few nations, notably Canada and Sweden, maintained large-scale eugenics programs, including forced sterilization of mentally handicapped individuals, as well as other practices, until the 1970s. Sweden forcibly sterilized 62,000 “unfits” as part of a eugenics program over a forty year period. Similar incidents occurred in Canada, Australia, Norway, Finland, Denmark, Estonia, Switzerland and Iceland for people the government declared to be mentally deficient.

Various authors, notably Stephen Jay Gould,⁴⁹ have repeatedly asserted that restrictions on immigration passed in the United States during the 1920s (and overhauled in 1965) were motivated by the goals of eugenics, in particular a desire to exclude “inferior” races from the national gene pool. During the early twentieth century the United States and Canada began to receive far higher numbers of southern and eastern European immigrants. Influential eugenicists like Lothrop Stoddard and Harry Laughlin (who was appointed as an expert witness for the *House Committee on Immigration and Naturalization* in 1920) presented arguments that these were inferior races who would pollute the national gene pool if their numbers went unrestricted. It has been argued that this stirred both Canada and the United States into passing laws creating a hierarchy of nationalities, rating them from the most desirable Anglo-Saxon and Nordic peoples to the Chinese and Japanese immigrants who were almost completely banned from entering the country.⁵⁰

Therefore, this eugenics which was literally begotten by Darwin led to a variety of ‘scientific methods’ which were/are unethical and in total opposition to anything that can be termed ‘unbiased’, ‘impartial’ or ‘neutral.’

⁴⁹ Stephen J. Gould, *The Mismeasure of Man* (New York: Norton, 1981).

⁵⁰ See ‘eugenics’ at [wikipedia](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Eugenics).

A contemporary example of the fallacy of this blind following and trust in anything deemed as ‘scientific’ can be seen with racist theories such as that of the book *The Bell Curve*.

EVOLUTIONIST: I do not know much about this book, what is it about?

MUSLIM: Authored by Charles Murray and Richard Herrnstein, the book attempts to give a scientific justification for racial discrimination in America arguing that those of African origin have lower intelligence than those of European origin, with those of African origin the lowest in the evolutionary scale. Even though it was argued that the book was based upon ‘mainstream scientific enquiry’⁵¹ in fact even Murray, who himself was by no means a scientist in any case, mentioned that “**Some of the things we read to do this work, we literally hide when we're on planes and trains,**” Murray told the *New York Times Magazine* (10/9/94). Indeed, much of the research that Murray and Herrnstein relied on for their central claims about race and IQ was funded by the *Pioneer Fund*, described by the London *Sunday Telegraph* (3/12/89) as a “**neo-Nazi organization closely integrated with the far right in American politics.**”⁵² The fund’s mission is to promote eugenics, a philosophy that maintains that “genetically unfit” individuals or races are a threat to society. The *Pioneer Fund* was set up in 1937 by Wickliffe Draper, a

⁵¹ After publication of the book, many blind followers of it in the US media claimed, even though they had not read it or were totally ignorant of the background of the financers of the book, claimed that it was a ‘mainstream scientific study’ (!?). Nicholas Lemann in ‘*The Bell Curve Flattened - Subsequent research has seriously undercut the claims of the controversial best seller*’, notes the following: ***The Bell Curve, it turns out, is full of mistakes ranging from sloppy reasoning to mis-citations of sources to outright mathematical errors. Unsurprisingly, all the mistakes are in the direction of supporting the authors' thesis...Meanwhile, the psychometricians who dominate the footnotes of The Bell Curve are John Hunter, Arthur Jensen, Malcolm Ree, and Frank Schmidt. These men are well known within the field as representing its right wing, not a mainstream consensus.***”

⁵² Much of the background facts regarding the racist pseudo-scientific ‘*Pioneer Fund*’ in this section is from Jim Naureckas, “*Racism Resurgent: How Media Let The Bell Curve's Pseudo-Science Define the Agenda on Race*” in *Extra!* (Jan/Feb. 1995).

millionaire who advocated sending those of African descent in America back to Africa. The foundation's charter set forth the group's missions as "racial betterment" and aid for people "deemed to be descended primarily from white persons who settled in the original 13 states prior to the adoption of the Constitution of the United States."⁵³

The fund's first president, Harry Laughlin, was an influential advocate of sterilization for those he considered genetically unfit. In successfully advocating laws that would restrict immigrants from Southern and Eastern Europe, Laughlin testified before Congress that 83 percent of Jewish immigrants were innately feeble-minded (*Rolling Stone*, 10/20/94). Another founder, Frederick Osborn, described Nazi Germany's sterilization law as "a most exciting experiment" (*Discovery Journal*, 7/9/94). The fund's treasurer, John Trevor, formerly served as treasurer for the crypto-fascist *Coalition of Patriotic Societies*, when it called in 1962 for the release of Nazi war criminals and praised South Africa's "well-reasoned racial policies" (*Rolling Stone*, 10/20/94). One of the *Pioneer Fund's* largest current grantees is Roger Pearson, an activist and publisher who has been associated with international fascist currents. Pearson has written:

"If a nation with a more advanced, more specialized or in any way superior set of genes mingles with, instead of exterminating, an inferior tribe, then it commits racial suicide." (Russ Bellant, *Old Nazis, the New Right and the Republican Party*).

These are the people that financed nearly all *The Bell Curve's* "scientific data" on the connection between race and intelligence. In Chapter 13 of the book, which Murray has claimed is the only chapter that deals with race (even though there are at least four chapters focused entirely on race, and the whole book is organized around the concept!!) Murray and Herrnstein's

⁵³ In 1985, after *Pioneer Fund* grant recipients began receiving political heat, the charter was slightly amended to play down the race angle, see: Jim Naureckas, *op cit.*

claims about the higher IQs of Asians - widely cited in the US media as fact - are almost entirely cited to Richard Lynn, a professor of psychology at the *University of Ulster*. In the book's acknowledgements, Murray and Herrnstein declare they "benefited especially from the advice" of Lynn and five other people. Lynn has received at least \$325,000 from the *Pioneer Fund* (*Rolling Stone*, 10/20/94). He frequently publishes in eugenicist journals like *Mankind Quarterly* - published by Roger Pearson and co-edited by Lynn himself - and *Personality and Individual Differences*, edited by Pioneer grantee Hans Eysenck. Among Lynn's writings cited in *The Bell Curve* are "The Intelligence of the Mongoloids" and "Positive Correlations Between Head Size and IQ." Murray and Herrnstein describe Lynn as "a leading scholar of racial and ethnic differences." Here's a sample of Lynn's thinking on such differences:

"What is called for here is not genocide, the killing off of the population of incompetent cultures. But we do need to think realistically in terms of the 'phasing out' of such peoples.... Evolutionary progress means the extinction of the less competent. To think otherwise is mere sentimentality." (cited in *Newsday*, 11/9/94).

Elsewhere Lynn makes clear which "**incompetent cultures**" need "**phasing out**" (!):

"Who can doubt that the Caucasoids and the Mongoloids are the only two races that have made any significant contributions to civilization?" (cited in *New Republic*, 10/31/94).⁵⁴

But *The Bell Curve* cites as its primary sources for this assertion (that black IQs are 15 points lower than whites!) R. Travis Osborne, Frank C.J. McGurk and Audrey Shuey, 'coincidentally' (!) all recipients of *Pioneer Fund*

⁵⁴ Jim Naureckas, *op cit.*

By extension of Lynn's intended argument then, is that Africans, Arabs, Jews, Turks, Kurds, Aborigines, Maoris, Inuit tribes and many others should all be "**phased out**" as they have "**not made any significant contributions to civilisation**"!!? [TN]

grants!! Osborne, who has received almost \$400,000 from *Pioneer Fund*, used his “research” into “black genetic inferiority” to argue for the restoration of school segregation (*Newsday*, 11/9/94)!!

Perhaps the weirdest of all of *Pioneer Fund*’s beneficiaries is J. Philippe Rushton. Rushton (who has received more than \$770,000 from *Pioneer Fund*!!) has transformed the Victorian science of cranial measurement into a sexual fetish! Rushton was reprimanded by his school, the *University of Western Ontario*, for accosting people in a local shopping mall and asking them how big their penises were?! A 1986 article by Rushton suggested that the Nazi war machine owed its prowess to racial purity, and worried that demographic shifts were endangering “our Northern European” civilization. Rushton co-authored a paper that argued that blacks have a *genetic propensity* to contract AIDS because of their “reproductive strategy” of promiscuous sex (cited in *Newsday*, 11/9/94).

This is the reality behind the so-called ‘scientific foundation’ and ‘mainstream science’ of the *Bell Curve*’ inquisition instigated by Murray and Herrnstein. With this, Jim Naureckas concludes:

“Anyone who flipped through the footnotes and bibliography of Murray and Herrnstein’s book could see that there was something screwy about their sources. And there is hardly a proposition in their book that had not been thoroughly debunked more than a decade ago by Steven Jay Gould’s classic work on the pseudo-science behind eugenics, *The Mismeasure of Man*. So why is *The Bell Curve* suddenly an “important book” that needs to have cover stories, news broadcasts, even whole magazines devoted to it? In large part, because the book is well-timed to take advantage of a resurgence of racism in U.S. media and society--a racism that does not want to face up to its own identity. In a proposal outlining the book, Murray wrote that there is “a huge number of well-meaning whites who fear that they are closet racists, and this book tells them they are not. It’s going to make them feel better about things they already think

but do not know how to say.” (*New York Times Magazine*, 10/9/94) *The Bell Curve* does indeed tell closet racists that they aren't racist, and makes them feel better by saying that their prejudices are grounded in science. *The Bell Curve* also fits in well with some current political agendas. The immigration issue has been seized upon by the U.S. right wing, as it has by the far right in other countries. Much of Murray and Herrnstein's book is devoted to suggesting that “Latino and black immigrants are...putting some downward pressure on the distribution of intelligence.” The connection between the book and the anti-immigrant movement is, once again, the Pioneer Fund; the fund has always feared immigrants, although its concerns have shifted from Poles and Italians to blacks and Latinos. The leading anti-immigration group in the U.S. is the Federation for American Immigration Reform (unfortunately sharing an acronym with the media watch group FAIR); the federation has received more than \$1 million in Pioneer money, which was critical in getting the organization off the ground. (See *Extra!*, 7-8/93.) Pioneer also funds the American Immigration Control Foundation, a more overtly racist group whose work is cited by Murray and Herrnstein.”

Therefore, science is not always as ‘laden with overwhelming evidences’ and ‘impartiality’ that many simplistically claim. Indeed, it is those who are so naïve to blindly follow anything that ‘science’ may seem to tell them who are those most susceptible to following such incredulous pseudo-scientific nonsense justified under the rubric of ‘evolution theory.’

EVOLUTIONIST: But my thing with the Creator is that it can be demonstrated that religion began with humanity worshipping the forces of nature due to their amazement at the cataclysmic and devastating effects of their environments and the natural world. Thus, thunder, lightening, earthquakes, volcanoes etc were believed to be conceived of supernatural beings. Thus, humans sought ways to appease the beings through rites, rituals, prayers and sacrifices. The native North Americans, who believe in spirits of the river and of the forest, are used as examples of this early stage in the evolution of religion, known as Animism.

Eventually *Diathesis* emerged in which all of the supernatural powers were confined in two main gods, usually a god of good and a god of evil. According to the evolutionists, an example of this stage can be seen in the religion of the Zoroastrians of Persia. Before the emergence of the Persian ‘reformer’ Zarathustra,⁵⁵ Persians were thought to have believed in nature spirits, clan gods and family gods. According to the evidence gathered and interpreted by anthropologists, during Zoroaster’s time tribal gods were reduced to two: *Abura Mazda* who created good and *Angora Mazda* who created evil. When tribes gave way to nations, tribal gods in turn gave way to a national god and monotheism was supposedly born. Thus, according to this view, monotheism has no divine origin. It was merely a by-product of the evolution of early man’s superstitions based on the lack of scientific knowledge.

MUSLIM: The distinguished scholar of *hadeeth* Shaykh Muhammad Naasiruddeen al-Albaanee (*raheemahullaah*)⁵⁶ stated “**It is established in**

⁵⁵ In Greek, Zoroaster

⁵⁶ He was born in Albania but grew up in Syria where he became one of the main Islamic scholars and is noted for being the reviver (*Mujaddid*) and leading scholar of *hadeeth* of the century and one of the revivers of the religion of Islaam. He taught for some time at the *Madeenah Islamic University* and dedicated many of his books to the university library. He compiled landmark research on *hadeeth* such

Islaam and the Sharee'ah that mankind in the beginning was a single nation upon true tawheed then shirk gradually overcame them. The basis for this is the saying of Allaah,

كَانَ النَّاسُ أُمَّةً وَاحِدَةً فَبَعَثَ اللَّهُ النَّبِيِّنَ مُبَشِّرِينَ وَمُنذِرِينَ

“Mankind was one Ummah then Allah sent the Prophets as bringers of good tidings and warners”

{*al-Baqarah* (2): 213}

Ibn Abbaas⁵⁷, *may Allaah be pleased with him*, said “*between Prophet Nooh (Noah) and Aadam, peace be upon them both, were ten generations, all of them were upon the Sharee'ah of truth, but then they differed. So Allaah sent Prophets to bring good news and also warn their people.*”

Shaykh al-Albaanee then went on to say that this refutes the philosophers and atheists who claim that the natural basis of man is *Shirk*,⁵⁸ and that *Tawheed* evolved in man! The preceding *Aayah* refutes this claim as do the following authentic *hadeeth*. The Prophet Muhammad (*sallallaahu alayhi wassallam*) related from Allaah, that Allaah said, ‘*I created all my servants upon the true religion (Tawheed free from Shirk), then the devils came to them and led them astray from their true religion. They made unlawful to people that which I had made lawful for them, and they commanded them to associate in worship with Me that for which*

as *Silsilah al-Hadeeth as-Saheehah* and *ad-Da'eefah*. He also authored *Tahdheer as-Saajid*, *at-Tawassul*, *Fiqh ul-Waaqi'ee* etc.

⁵⁷ ‘Abdullaah ibn Abbaas (died 68 AH/687 CE), he was the cousin of the Prophet Muhammad (*sallallaahu alayhi wassallam*) and one of the most eminent scholars of the Qur'aan amongst the companions. He was thus known as *Turjumaan ul-Qur'aan* (The Commentator of the Qur'aan) and was also a prominent jurist and hadeeth scholar. His comments of the Qur'aan form part of all the commentaries on the Qur'aan. However, many comments attributed to him are not authentic. The so-called ‘*Commentary of Ibn Abbaas*’ compiled by Aboo Taahir Muhammad ibn Ya'qoob al-Fayroozabaadee is not his work.

⁵⁸ *Shirk* is directing worship to others besides Allaah, it includes idol-worship, saint-worship and the idolatry of superstitions, palm-reading, tea leaf reading, crystal ball gazing, sorcery, magic, divination, claiming to know unseen realms of existence etc.

*I had sent down no authority.*⁵⁹ Also Muhammad (*sallallaahu alayhi wassallam*) stated that, ‘*Every child is born upon the Fitrah but the parents make them into a Jew or a Christian or a Magian*⁶⁰.’

EVOLUTIONIST: But what is the evidence that this happened? What proof is there?

MUSLIM: The evidence which proves that humanity’s monotheistic concept of One God degenerated into idol-worship, man-worship, saint worship, and minor gods is extensive. Islam believes that humans beings started out as worshipping God alone then after deviated into various forms of polytheism as have just been mentioned. Islam holds that God sent Messengers to all the tribes and nations of the Earth to guide them back to the path of monotheism.

وَلَقَدْ بَعَثْنَا فِي كُلِّ أُمَّةٍ رَّسُولًا أَنْ اعْبُدُوا اللَّهَ وَاجْتَنِبُوا الطَّاغُوتَ

“We (Allaah) indeed sent to every nation Messengers (saying)
“worship Allaah and leave aside Taaghoot (false deities)”

{*an-Nahl* (16): 36}

The Islamic scholar Ibn ul-Atheer mentioned that “**The Fitrah is that which is innate to every human being, a pre-disposition to the true religion and if man was left upon this he would continue upon it. However, those who deviate from this do so due to following human weaknesses and blind following of others.**”⁶¹ Thus, we find amongst all of the so-called primitive tribes that have been discovered, the belief in One Supreme God. The central America Mayans believe in One God who

⁵⁹ A *hadeeth-qudsee* is a divinely inspired hadeeth directly from Allaah to Muhammad (*salallaahu alayhi wassallam*). This narration is related by Muslim and Ahmad from ‘Iyyaah ibn Himaar al-Mujaash’ee (*radi Allaahu anhu*).

⁶⁰ A fire-worshipper, ‘*Majoos*’ in Arabic, ‘*Zoroastrian*’ in English.

⁶¹ *an-Nihaayah* (3/457).

created everything, whom they call *Itzamna*,⁶² the *Mende* peoples of Sierra Leone in West Africa believe in One God who created the universe and spirits who they call *Ngewo*,⁶³ in the ancient Babylon the main deity of the city, *Marduk*,⁶⁴ was seen as the Supreme God. In Hinduism, ‘*Brahman*’ is the impersonal Eternal Absolute One God having no beginning and no end.⁶⁵ In the *Yoruba* religion, followed by over 10 million people in West Africa (mainly Nigeria), there is One Supreme God, *Olorius/Olodumare* (The Lord of the Heavens). Nevertheless, modern *Yoruba* religion is characterised by a multitude of *Orisha* worship rites which thus render the religion closer to polytheism. One of the first Western scholars to acknowledge the significance of the trend from monotheism to extreme polytheism was Stephen Langdon of Oxford. Langdon took the view that the Sumerians were the oldest historic civilisation and noted:

“In my opinion the history of the oldest civilisation of man is a rapid decline from monotheism to extreme polytheism and widespread belief in spirits. It is in a very true sense the history the fall of man.”⁶⁶

Edward McCrady, writing about Indian religious observed that even the *Rig Veda* (Book 1, p.164) shows that in the early gods were regarded simply as diverse manifestations of One Single Divine Being, he stated that:

“They call him *Indra*, *Mythra*, *Varunna*, *Agnee* – all of these are different terms for the One Wise God.”⁶⁷

Chinese scholars of history sometimes divide their ancient period into three separate periods: first, the primal-ancient, second, the mid-ancient and thirdly, the near ancient, the first period roughly stretches from the 21st to

⁶² John Hinnels, *Dictionary of Religions* (Penguin Books: 1884), p. 93.

⁶³ Ibid., p.210.

⁶⁴ Ibid., p.204.

⁶⁵ Ibid., p.68.

⁶⁶ Stephen H. Langdon, “*Mythology of all Races*,” in *Semitic Mythology Journal* (Vol. 5, Archaeological Institute of America: 1931), p. xviii/p.18.

⁶⁷ Edward McCrady, “*Genesis and Pagan Cosmologies*,” [Trans. Vict. Institute; Vol. 72 (1940), p.55]

the 12th century BCE. According to Ron Williams, who read Chinese, each of these periods possessed its own distinctive religious characteristics, and the first was clearly monotheistic. Williams also noted that:

“In this period of Chinese history, God the Supreme Ruler was One and indivisible, incapable of change, having no equal, ruling absolutely and alone over all in heaven above and in Earth beneath. He did what He willed and no power was able to hinder Him, and His will was always right.”⁶⁸

In the series journal *The Great Ages of Man*, one particular volume was published dealing with ancient China authored by Edward H. Schafer who noted:

“One of the oldest and certainly the greatest of deities was the Sky God *Ti'en*. In the very early days *Ti'en* was thought of as a great King in the sky, more magnificent than any earth bound kin. Later many viewed *Ti'en* as an impersonal dynamo, the source of energy that animated the world.”⁶⁹

Another very important work on the early monotheism of ‘primitive peoples’ is that by Wilhelm Schmidt which, though originally a voluminous work in German, was published in 1930 in a condensed English translation as a single volume. Schmidt discovered in his studies that he found the primitive cultures at the lowest cultural levels had the purer concepts of God. He noted that as one progresses from mere hunters to food gatherers, and food storers to food growers as pastoral nomads maintaining flocks, to food growers who have settled land use, and on up the scale to semi-urban communities, one finds at first a simple faith in a Supreme God who has no wife or family. According to Schmidt we find this form of belief among the Pygmies of central Africa, the south-eastern Australian Aborigines, the native Americas of north-central California, the primitive Algonquians, and to a certain extent the Koryaks and Ainu. To sum up his findings very briefly his own words are:

⁶⁸ Ron Williams, “*Early Chinese Monotheism*,” a thesis paper presented before the *Kelvin Institute* (Toronto, 1938).

⁶⁹ Edward H. Schafer, “*Ancient China*,” in *The Great Ages of Man* (New York: Time Life, 1967) p. 58.

“Going back to the most primitive people, the Pygmies of Africa of the central Australian Aborigines or the central American Indians – all have One Supreme God to whom they make their offerings...all these peoples also have short prayers...”⁷⁰

Andrew Lang noted that the

“Australian Aborigines probably have one of the most simple cultures of any people known, but they have religious concepts which are so lofty that it would be natural to explain them as a result of European influence.”⁷¹

At the time of writing Lang felt that this explanation was justified because in his environment their concept of God was seen as being the most ‘evolved’ and ‘civilised.’ Lang also mentioned that the inhabitants of the Andaman Islands, whom he considered to be at the same cultural level as the Aborigines, believed in One God, they described Him as being invisible, *Immortal, The Creator* of all things (except evil), *The Knower* of what is in the hearts and minds, *The One* who is angered by falsehood and wrong doing, helps those in distress or pain. Further, their concept of God was that He is *The Judge of Souls* and at some future time will preside over a great judgement. The information supplied to Lang came from the older members of the community who were not acquainted with other peoples at that time. As Lang says, **“...foreign influence seems to have been more than usually excluded (in their concept of God).”**⁷²

Sameul Zwemer spoke of the monotheistic character of the Bushmen, as well as many peoples of the Arctic cultures which he maintained is **“Clear...even to a cursory examination.”**⁷³ In his paper he was not merely reiterating what others have observed, namely, that all these primitive

⁷⁰ Wilhelm Schmidt, *The Origin and Growth of Religion – Facts and Theories*, (London: 1931) p. 131, (translated by HJ Rose).

⁷¹ Andrew Lang, *The Making of Religion* (London: Longmans Green, 1909) pp. 175-182, 196.

⁷² Ibid., p.196.

⁷³ Samuel Zwemer, “*The Origin of Religion – By Evolution or by Revelation,*” (Trans. Vict. Institute, Volume 67; 1937) p. 189.

peoples have knowledge of One Supreme God, but rather that the Supreme God whom they recognise is essentially the same figure with the same attributes. Canon Titcombe noted that when speaking of the Zulus, quoting a former Bishop of Natal who had a firsthand knowledge of the Zulus while they were still culturally intact, as stating that they had no idols but rather acknowledged One Supreme Being who was known as The *Great One*, The *All-Mighty*, The *First* etc.⁷⁴ Titcombe also noted the concept of One God amongst the Madagascan natives.⁷⁵ All of this evidence led Paul Radin to conclude, after mentioning Lang's work: "**his intuitive insight has been abundantly corroborated.**"⁷⁶ Moreover, *The Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* published a paper by E.O. James in which he concluded:

"Thus, it is impossible to maintain a unilateral (one sided and single) evolution in religious thought and practice as suggested by the rationalists Frazer, Tylor and Comte's *Three Stages*.' Nevertheless, neither the speculation that the idea of God arose in ancestor worship as revived by Herbert Spencer, nor the Frazerian evolution model of polytheism and animism to monotheism can be reconciled with the One Supreme tribal God which is a recurrent feature of the primitive concept of God."⁷⁷

The degeneration of monotheism can be seen in Buddhism which began in the 6th century as a reform movement within Hinduism. Later on however, gigantic colossal statues and images of the Buddha were erected and surrounded by flowers, incense etc. Buddhists further performed a number of rituals to these statues that include prostrating and bowing. In addition the Dalai Lama of Tibet is worshiped as a man-god, with his devotees prostrating to him. This is also observable in the *Naqshabandandee Soofee* world movement with their current leader Naazim Qubrusee and also other

⁷⁴ J.H. Titcombe, "Prehistoric Monotheism," (Trans. Vict. Institute, Vol. 8, 1937) p. 145.

⁷⁵ ibid, p. 144.

⁷⁶ Paul Radin, *Primitive Men as Philosophers* (New York: 1956) p. 346.

⁷⁷ E.O. James, "Religion and Reality," in *The Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* (Vol. 79, 1950) p. 28.

‘miracle workers’ such as Sai Baba and ‘Ayatollahs’. All of these men are worshiped besides Allaah and demonstrate the degeneration of monotheism into polytheism.